CANDOUR The British Views-Letter

To defend national sovereignty against the menace of international finance

Volume XLVI Number 2 February 1994

The A.B.C. of Politics

OVER THE MOON

by ROSINE de BOUNEVIALLE

IN bygone days it was the habit of Heads of State, when they found themselves in any domestic difficulty, to provoke either a declaration of war or an "intolerable" insult from some unpopular Royal neighbour, so that in the excitement of retaliatory hostilities, the local unrest would be forgotten. In these days, owing to the prevalence of so-called democratic governments, it is usually necessary for the overall directing Power to find some other more plausible and transient distraction.

The spectacular advances in all branches of technology, financed by entrepreneurs in all theatres of war, make it possible for both the alleged victors and the undoubted vanquished to be destroyed or promoted according to the demands of the next phase in global manipulation.

For decades after the alleged end of World War II the manipulators found it necessary to take the people's minds off the anomaly of the concurrent Cold War and the Space Race. When East is East and West is West and never the twain should meet in peace, it was, of course, imperative to conceal from the gullible public the fact that both had been founded and funded by the same mysterious munificent power - the Money Power.

"Oh dear, the Russians have beaten us. Yuri Gargarin is the man of the new age," was the rueful greeting of American Space-Agers. But not to worry - we had manager Kennedy who had promised a revitalised team; the Moon in no more than ten years. There was euphoria all round - and they made it. Moon walks, space stations, recoverable shuttles, no limits, next stop Mars. The Russians were not such bad fellows after all. With co-operation, we could all go together: dogs, monkeys, women, ethnic minorities - all must populate the realms of Outer Space.

Poor little Earth was left rudderless as an abandoned ship until suddenly even the rats had nowhere to go. The latest "lift-off" fell out of the sky into the deadly, mourning hush, and "the people" were in the news once more. "The Brits" revived. The Imperial corpse arose and defended its second last pocket of Empire. The Americans were concerned with the economic Yellow Peril.

So the Cold War began to melt. The Russians had been so kind and considerate over NASA's debacle that it would not now be necessary for Americans to beggar themselves with Star Wars, went the media comments of the 'eighties. Rather should they concentrate on unity and co-operation, as the Europeans were doing with Common Market trading hopefully to peace and prosperity; resuscitated economies reviving in racial, religious and cultural harmony.

Whilst everybody had been Moon-gazing, the world had been manoeuvred quite a distance along the backways to the Money Power's goal of One-[Devil-dominated]-world. The post-World War II European Coal and Steel Community had progressed through Benelux, EFTA, the Common Market, the European Community to Maastricht and the European Union.

Now that the world seems to be teetering on the brinks of national triumph or of international disaster, we are back to square one. At the back end of 1993, the Americans' eyes were once more focussed on Space, Moon and Mars, whilst Britons, having been divested of all finance for modern defence, exploration and invention, had their eyes directed to "the war in our own back-yard", i.e. the demonstrably phoney "peace discussions" in "the Other Island".

The Americans, in the meanwhile, have gone through UNO, NATO, GATT, and most recently NAFTA to rapprochement with crypto-Communist Russia and the new WTO [World Trade Organisation], from whose decisions US manufacturers will have no appeal. What a familiar ring that has!

This loathsome progression has been achieved without significant protest from disintegrated nations and with active but clandestine co-operation of the puppets masquerading as "the freely elected representatives of the people". It is time - more than time - for the threatened people to stop looking in media-managed directions and to concentrate on their own salvation. Do let us get over the Moon syndrome and organise our own defence.

Once we comrades are ever aware of the Enemy's strategy and tactics he will be defeated, since it is plain that our blindness is essential for the Devil to prevail. Let us get going, see and conquer!

THE "PROTO-MINISTRIES" OF ONE-WORLD

DON BELL considers the Clinton Administration's efforts to edge nations closer to World Government

IT must have seemed a difficult time for Bill Clinton, Bilderberger, Trilateralist, Council on Foreign Relations member and President of the United States. All his problems, programmes, promises and denials had to be superseded by foreign policy decisions that must be made because he is the legal voice of America in international affairs. So he flew to Europe to seek approval as the world leader by the leaders of the six other countries comprising the Big Seven.

When Clinton headed for Brussels and the NATO summit, a White House senior official said, "We're at a moment of extraordinary strategic importance." To indicate he knew what he was talking about, this senior advisor [CFR?] listed the questions of strategic importance for which

Clinton should find the answers in Europe: [1] whether market and democratic reform will continue in the East bloc; [2] whether the border states will be able to trust Russia as a good neighbour or as an exploiter; [3] whether Ukraine will give up the nuclear weapons it still possesses; [4] whether Central Europe must look to the East in fear or the West in confidence; [5] whether NATO will be expanded to take in former Soviet Union captive states; [6] what will the world trade agenda be like now that the Uruguay Round of GATT is concluded? It is certain that the Establishment knew the answers before the questions were even asked.

Nevertheless, that final question is a worrisome one to the Elite because it is known that Mexico was the first "Third World" country that was to be turned into a "One World" country to be exploited by the Multinationals who have been held back previously by North American interests. What may have been a shock to the no-nation industrialists and the Central Bankers occurred on the first day that NAFTA became effective. A supposedly unknown and comparatively well armed and commanded military force, the Zapatista Army of National Liberation, seized six towns in the state of Chiapas. NAFTA was the fuse that lit the explosion. In its report of January 4 *The Washington Times* said the rebellion "was born from problems that NAFTA will solve slowly or might make even worse...NAFTA's goal of making Mexico's countryside more productive implies that small, inefficient producers will have to leave the land and move elsewhere to take advantage of better jobs [in the United States?]."

This latter point applies also to the United States. Lawrence Patterson's *Criminal Politics* for December 1993 noted that both NAFTA and GATT will "have a devastating effect on hundreds of thousands of American families across the United States and should be the subject of a national drive to impeach the Clintons. It is treason to destroy the livelihoods and economic security of loyal Americans who have paid their taxes and served their country in war and peace in many ways."

The 'House of World Order'

Pat Buchanan is not optimistic about the chances of defeating GATT as "once again Americans are surrendering a slice of their sovereignty". The worst feature of the GATT deal is the new WTO [World Trade Organisation]. This new supranational authority is shaping up as an all-powerful Court of World Trade from whose decisions US manufacturers will have no appeal [c.f. European Commission edicts infringing the sovereignty of British trade and industry - Ed.].

Mr Buchanan writes: "The WTO is no accident. It conforms to the vision of the Clintonites. In a 1992 *Time* essay, 'The Birth of the Global Nation', Strobe Talbott [now of the US State Department] painted that vision, calling GATT and the International Monetary Fund the 'proto-ministries of trade, finance and development for a united world'. A self-described optimist about the development of world government, Mr Talbott wrote, 'I'll bet that within the next hundred years nationhood as we know it will be obsolete; all states will recognise a single global authority. A phrase briefly fashionable in the mid-20th century - citizen of the world - will have assumed real meaning by the end of the 21st.' Two decades ago like-minded Richard Gardner [CFR, TC] said, 'We are likely to do better by building our house of world order from the bottom up rather than the top down... An end run around national sovereignty, eroding it piece by piece, is likely to get us to world order faster than the old-fashioned frontal attack.' Mr Gardner's words were prophetic."

In his *Time* article, Strobe Talbott [CFR, TC] wrote: "All countries are basically social arrangements... No matter how permanent and even sacred they may seem at any one time, in fact they are all artificial and temporary... Perhaps national sovereignty wasn't such a great idea after all... But it has taken events in our own wondrous and terrible century to clinch the case for world government." He spoke of GATT and the IMF as "proto-ministries" [first or chief managers] of trade, finance and development for a united world. Regarding GATT, he said that in the years ahead, after all nations have completed the ratification and legislative actions, the WTO [World Trade Organisation] will be "associated with the United Nations... But to avoid problems of nationalism, the plan to transform the WTO into an administrative department of the UN "must not become public yet. You can't achieve everything in your first agreement." We repeat: WTO is scheduled to become the manager of world trade, while the IMF will become the Treasury Department of the World Government, the United Nations.

NATO's New Purpose

We further propose that NATO, under a name-change and a new constitution, and after the ratification and legislative actions, will become the Police Department of the World Government. That is the principal reason Bill Clinton was sent on his just-ended mission to Europe. "You can't achieve everything in your first agreement," said Micky Kantor about GATT.

At the beginning of the so-called Cold War, the United States had been firmly established as the thesis in a worldwide Hegelian dialectic , and the USSR was established as the antithesis, which would lead to a synthesis, a New World Order. As part of the plan, NATO was created as a defence agency to prevent aggression by its antithesis, the Warsaw Pact. But with the planned "merging" of capitalism and communism and the end of the USSR and the Warsaw Pact, NATO was left dangling without proper aim or reason for existence. When the nations that comprised the USSR were 'set free' and incidents such as Bosnia developed, no nation or group of nations knew exactly what to do.

So Clinton was sent to Europe with a plan. The Big Seven group of nations accepted his proposals with some reservations. Having done all that could be done in two days, including his "Partnership for Peace" plan, he went on to Prague, Kiev, Minsk and Moscow - the capitals of the former Warsaw Pact nations - to reassure them without promising them military help if they might need it, and to tell Boris Yeltsin that he was still being backed 100 per cent by the Clinton Administration. Unstable political conditions in Russia and former Warsaw Pact nations is the real reason for denying them membership of NATO at this time. Once they are politically stable, with no internal revolt or threat of war against a neighbour, they will be welcomed with full membership in NATO.

Don Bell edits the fortnightly newsletter, *Don Bell Reports*, which is available by airmail to British readers for $50 per annum from Post Office Box 2223, Palm Beach, Florida 33480, USA.

Editor's comment *- What a familiar ring to Don Bell's prediction about NATO! We recall Churchill's strange speech at Aachen decades ago when he proposed that one day the Soviet Union might be invited to join NATO. If this truly Baruchian proposal is likely to become reality, it would confirm A.K. Chesterton's long-held view about the essentially expedient nature of this alliance for the so-called containment of Communism.*

THE DEFENCE OF THE WEST

This second article in our "back to basics" series by A.K. CHESTERTON takes up part of the theme in Don Bell's piece by questioning the effectiveness of the NATO alliance for Britain's vital defence interests. It was originally published on December 11, 1953.

IT may well have been with the desire to offset the possibility of a relaxation of international tension resulting from the Bermuda Conference that the B.B.C. allowed Lord Tweedsmuir to fill listeners with fear about the supposed menace of the present world situation. This dim-sighted son of a clear-sighted father spoke as a hot-gospeller for the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation, which he sees as the sole defence of the West against a Soviet Union intent upon the military domination of mankind. He did not explain why, if conquest by force of arms be its aim, Moscow is obligingly waiting until Western strength is built up, and the Russian periphery stringed with American atom-bomber bases. Is it because the Soviet Government wants to make sure that in the next world war every Russian city is obliterated? Lord Tweedsmuir took care not to frame that question, perhaps because to answer it would unduly have taxed his intellectual faculties.

That Moscow would like to be the dominant world power one does not for a moment doubt. It is even conceivable, however grotesquely improbable, that she plans to secure such domination by military means. Nations which are responsibly led have to beware of that contingency, as they should be aware of possible menace arising from the ambitions of any other power or group of powers. But those who single out the Soviet Union as the predestined enemy surely have a moral obligation to explain why, if military aggression from that quarter be inevitable, it did not occur when the number of Eastern divisions ready for war outnumbered effective Western divisions by about two hundred to six.

There is no doubt whatever that this particular scare has been used, and will continue to be used, to enable the United States, the Soviet Union's rival for the mastery of the world, to further ambitions no less hostile to British and other European interests than is the power-drive of the Russian Empire masquerading as international Communism.

DANGER AHEAD

The North Atlantic Treaty Organisation has provided no security which could not have been achieved through alliances of sovereign states. Indeed, in the event of war such integration of forces as has been built up under N.A.T.O.'s auspices might lead to irreparable disaster. One or two examples must immediately establish this truth. There existed in 1940 a joint plan for the defence of British Somaliland and French Somaliland. When France was knocked out of the war the bottom was also knocked out of this precious plan, with the result that British Somalilland was overrun in a few days. Again, had N.A.T.O. existed in that year, it is absolutely certain that the R.A.F. would have been fully committed to the Battle of France, with the result that there would not even have been a Battle of Britain: the Luftwaffe would have found itself unopposed. Should war come tomorrow, what would prevent precisely that kind of situation arising?

The essence of the N.A.T.O. principle is specialisation, military and industrial. Every nation—except, of course, the United States—has had to surrender a balanced defence so as to make its potential war effort a cog in the collective machine. In the event of any other cog's proving defective, the entire machine could be brought to a standstill and the whole of Western Europe, including the British Isles, left virtually bereft of defence. There is, admittedly, what there so conspicuously was not either in 1914 or 1940, United States participation in European strategy—what Sir Winston, in one of his resounding phrases, has called: " the massive American shield." But even were reliance for protection upon others a sound principle for any self-respecting nation, there would still remain to be asked how reliable that shield really is. What guarantee is there that it would not, in the event of crisis, be precipitately withdrawn?

GREATER MENACE

In the last two wars American public opinion was fundamentally isolationist: that isolationism had to give way before the determination of the New York Money Power, for motives certainly not altruistic, to involve the United States in both conflicts. There is no reason to suppose that in a third world war the Money Power might not act upon the opposite impulse—to withdraw the United States from the battlefields. Does this seem improbable? It certainly does not seem improbable to those who know that the Schiffs, the Warburgs and other lords of international finance in New York financed the Russian Revolution of 1917 and that many who succeeded them retain those sympathies to this day, fighting to the last ditch on behalf of traitors like Alger Hiss and smearing the name of Macarthy throughout the world. What is more, although American isolationism is now in retreat not much persuasion would be required to make it flow again full tide. Before the war an American radio programme broadcast a play about the invasion of the earth by men from another planet: taking it literally, New Yorkers by the tens of thousands went into screaming hysterics. One trembles to think of what would happen to morale of this calibre were a well-placed hydrogen-bomb exploded in New York or Washington. That is why the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation is potentially as deadly a menace as the Red Army or the Red Air Force: it is a menace because its safety is an illusion which could betray us into the hands of that army and expose us to that air force. Actually—as distinct from potentially—the menace of N.A.T.O. is the greater of the two, because it subordinates the whole non-Communist world to American command on land, sea and in the air and makes progressive inroads upon the national sovereignty of its components on behalf of the Dollar-Emperors of New York.

The rôle of Britain in the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation is a ludicrous one. Propagandists here and in America, anxious to drive us panic-stricken into a cosmopolitan hugger-mugger responsive to the requirements of the masters of policy, have long been insisting that Britain in the atomic age is military indefensible. Yet, like the rest of Western Europe, she has been allotted an almost entirely defensive task. Striking power has been largely reserved to the United States, so that if there should be a return to isolationism—whether or not induced by a hydrogen-bomb—the West might find itself having to fight the third world war with almost no offensive weapons in its armoury. That would mean certain catastrophe.

If the British Isles in the atomic-age be indeed indefensible, then it is obvious that the millions we are spending on defensive armaments are being poured down the drain. The enormously expensive rockets which seek out and destroy enemy planes in that event are all part of the furnishings of our fool's paradise. It may be true that there is no effective defence for Britain against atom-bombing. If so, the need is all the greater to remember what was once axiomatic, but what is no longer fashionable to recall —that the best means of defence is attack. There are still enough British bases scattered about the world to visit appalling punishment upon any country seeking our destruction: properly organised on an atomic-war footing, these bases could wield a power of utter deterrence. Why do our leaders never think in those terms? Because it

would bring them face-to-face with an infuriated Money Power determined to keep the issue of peace and war in its own hands.

American "moms", upset at the prospect of the absence overseas of Junior, have been assured that the increased potency of weapons will soon make possible a great diminution in the numbers of G.I.s stationed abroad. The argument is so sound that one wonders why there has has been no clamour for British strategy to be reconsidered in this light. As long as the emphasis remained on quantity, as in the mass-armies of the two world-wars, the future for this country looked grim. But the emphasis has swung back to quality, which makes us in the military sense potentially as tall as Americans or Russians. The man with a revolver who tackles a burglar is not better armed because he may have another dozen revolvers strung round his neck. In the same way the question is not which nation makes the most atom-bombs but which nation is best placed to use them where they would have most salutary effect. Great Britain, with its world-system, would be in a unique position to keep the peace of the atomic age. That advantage she is deliberately surrendering. The surrender has about it the smack of betrayal. Instead of reasserting the *Pax Britannica*, as the swing-back to qualitative armaments makes possible, we are engaged in the double process of preparing to clear out of Suez and admitting the Americans to Malta, ensuring that soon there will be no area of deployment and manoeuvre possible to us. We act as though it were a cardinal principle that British independence should be sacrificed. Otherwise we would not go a-whoring after N.A.T.O.

None of these considerations. we may be sure, entered the innocent head of Lord Tweedsmuir when he undertook to lecture the listening world on the problems of defence. Indeed, he made clear that he is not satisfied that N.A.T.O. should have purely military significance. He wants it to enter both the political and the economic fields, blindly unconscious that what he suggests would be, in effect, an international socialist tyranny run in the interests of international finance capital. Imagination reels at the thought of the N.A.T.O. Super-Parliament which he advocates. Lord Tweedsmuir, bless him, means very well. We who run *Candour* nevertheless hope that one day the advocacy of any proposal to remove sovereignty from the Queen and people of Britain to a supranational authority will be treated as treason, because in every moral sense that is precisely what it is.

CUT AND THRUST

JANUS offers candid comment on news from home and abroad

AN all-party Commons report has recommended a £17 million refurbishment of the kitchens in the House of Commons, the standards of hygiene being such that they would be closed down if they were inspected by an Environmental Health Officer from the local council. To many people, the thought of the members of the House of Commons being poisoned produces mixed feelings. It is also said that mice and cockroaches run out of control; they are probably copying some of the back-benchers! In addition to the kitchens, it is proposed to spend almost £20 million on improvements, including £8 million on new offices, £50,000 on new works of art and £20,000 on coffee stations along a Commons corridor. A hairdressers' salon for women members is also planned, although the facilities could usefully be extended to certain male members if the *Sunday People* allegation is to be believed that two un-named MPs have had a romp in bed with a certain black bi-sexual footballer! Whenever a Parliamentary seat falls vacant there are hundreds of applicants for the post. How nice to think that there are so many public-spirited citizens ready to undergo deprivation and hardship for the sake of our country!

* * * *

PEOPLE generally appear to have a low opinion of politicians' morals, whether financial, sexual or whatever. At the same time, though, British people in public life are considered to be of a higher standard than those abroad. This is due not so much to the excellence of our rulers as to the dreadful types that one finds abroad. Not only do foreign politicians and civil servants bend (or ignore) the international rules when this favours their country (in Britain, we tend to do the exact opposite), but corruption in many, or most, foreign states seems to be endemic. China had £60 million misused in one province alone; there was a £700 million milk fraud in Italy; and the European "Parliament" costs £476 million a year to run, which amounts to over £900,000 per member. Our own lot do not do too badly: a Parliamentary question costs nearly £100 to answer and one Labour M.P. alone has asked 1,611 at a cost of £156,267. And he is one of many.

* * * *

THE contents of a war-time book by H.E. Bates, which describes the social impact of Germany's flying bombs, will be published this year after being hidden among public records for nearly half-a-century. Bates was asked by the Air Ministry to tell the story of Germany's V1 and V2 flying bombs, which droned over the Kent countryside as far as London, bringing death and destruction. Nearly 8,000 people were killed between June 1944 and the end of the war. We suspect Bates' *Flying Bombs Over England* will receive somewhat greater publicity and circulation than another manuscript published eleven years ago and called *Death of a City*.

Written by Mike McLaughlin, it described another war-time air attack, waged a year before the doodlebugs were developed and inflicted on Germany by England. We refer, of course, to the wanton barbarism of the destruction of Hamburg in the summer of 1943, when 6,000 acres of the city were reduced to rubble and an estimated 100,000 civilians lost their lives during ten horrific days of high-explosive and incendiary bombing. Their screams of agony, the howling of the fire-storms, the clattering explosions of bombs surpassed any representation of Hell as imagined by the most inspired of artists. By ordering the raids for the purpose of terrorising an enemy civilian population, the abominable Winston Churchill overturned rules of war that had endured for more than a thousand years of European history. So who are we to condemn the Germans for their flying bombs?

* * * *

A HOME Office immigration detention centre recently opened will provide compasses so that Muslim inmates will know that they are facing Mecca. Is it mean-minded to suggest that they provide such aids themselves, or at least apply to their numerous co-religionists already in this country? What is the possibility of finding a crucifix, or even a plain cross, provided in Muslim countries for Christians incarcerated in jails?

* * * *

MRS Winnie Mandela was elected head of the African National Congress Women's League and has made a dramatic come-back to politics. Was there not some prospect of her being sent to prison because of her responsibility in the case of a young African boy being beaten to death? Or has that been quietly dropped? Incidentally, has there ever been a street, avenue, square or block of council flats here in England named in memory of the unfortunate youth, one Stompie Moketsi? And if not, why not? After all, he was black. Let us not forget, too, the mystery of Nelson Mandela. A convicted terrorist who admitted his guilt, he was sent to prison, although fortunately for him (and the potential victims) he was not directly responsible for any deaths. He is now regarded world-wide as a cross between John the Baptist and Mahatma Gandhi. He has been received all over the world by the great ones of the earth and treated with a respect which few other leaders have been accorded. We wonder why. Who is responsible for this adulation and worship?

* * * *

FOR having the temerity to quote somebody who thought that if Menachem Begin ever visited these shores, he should be tried and executed, the *Catholic Times* provoked the wrath of a Mr John Myers, from Manchester. Whether he is Catholic or Jew, readers were not told, but what we were left in little doubt about was Mr Myers' view that the Irgun Zvai Leumi was no terrorist organisation. Indeed, to imply the Irgun gang could be compared to the I.R.A. was "a totally wrong and biased opinion...which could be unhelpful to good inter-denominational relations"! Begin's gangsters, we read incredulously, "vetoed all intended operations which would have caused inevitable casualties amongst civilians". How remarkable that in his tempest of indignation Mr Myers could have forgotten what happened at the King David Hotel in Jerusalem, which took a toll of 92 dead and 45 injured. How odd that he should have overlooked the killing in Wolverhampton, by means of a parcel-bomb, of the younger brother of Capt. Roy Farran, whom Zionist terrorists had sworn to "hunt down to the end of the world". The package was addressed to him, and his brother Rex took the full explosive charge in the stomach when he unwrapped a hollowed-out volume of Shakespeare's plays containing the death-trap. These, and countless other barbarities (including the slaughter of hundreds of innocent Arab civilians in one incident alone at Deir Yassin), were the trade-marks of the Irgun and Stern Gang terrorists, perpetrated in pursuit of their seizure of the Holy Land. Mr Myers claimed his view of events from reading accounts written "by those who had been directly involved". Of course! Of course!

FACING THE ABYSS is A.K. Chesterton's masterly analysis of the disastrous effects of liberalism on the national and racial identity of the British people. Only £3 from Candour Publishing Company.

A MINE OF INFORMATION. Back numbers of *Candour* are essential reading for all patriots newly engaged in the battle for national survival. Send £5 for 15 different issues to Candour Publishing Company.

PAUSE FOR THOUGHT - "He that will not sail until all the danger is over must never put to sea." *Thomas Fuller.*

THE LORD OF THE WORLD?

ROBERT Hugh Benson's *Lord of the World* was an exciting and informative novel set at the end of the twentieth century and covering the period leading into the reign of the Anti-Christ and culminating with Our Lord's Second Coming. Although written in 1907, much of what the author prophesied has already become reality. Archbishop Fulton Sheen regarded it as one of the three great apocalyptic pieces of literature dealing with the advent of the Satanic era.

Benson's prophetic view of a world under the suzerainty of Satan was no idle vision. Mindful of this, we were intrigued by a postcard sent to us showing a view of the world as allegedly seen by the Apollo 17 crewmen during the journey toward the Moon on their 1969 mission. Are we alone in detecting the image of Satan amid the swirls of cloud? See what your eyes can detect of the physiognomy of the World Conqueror.



READ *SPEARHEAD*. Edited by John Tyndall and published in support of the British National Party. Sample copy £1 from P.O. Box 117, Welling, Kent DA16 3DW.

THE UNDERMINING OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH. Mary Ball Martinez's astounding story of the infiltrators who have gained positions of power in order to undermine, in the name of "progress" and "ecumenism", that which was orthodox and traditional in the Church. We have available a limited stock recently imported from Mexico. Only £10 including postage from CANDOUR PUBLISHING COMPANY.

FREEDOM VIDEOS. A wide range of nationalist and revisionist VHS videos available in our latest sales list. Send an s.a.e. to Freedom Videos, B.M. Truth, London WC1N 3XX.

CANDOUR SUBSCRIPTION RATES

U.K. £15 OVERSEAS £20 U.S. $30 AIRMAIL PER ANNUM

Printed and published by Candour Publishing Company, Forest House, Liss Forest, Hampshire GU33 7DD.
[Editor: Rosine de Bounevialle]